

we might go through the thirties again because too many people refuse to listen to the truth, refuse to listen to what some of us see in Saddam Hussein, as being another Hitler.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 628 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING GENERAL AL LENHARDT

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, a little over 18 months ago, I came to this floor to welcome MG Alfonso Lenhardt to the Senate on his first day as this body's Sergeant at Arms.

Tomorrow will be GEN Lenhardt's last day in the Senate.

It is with profound admiration, and more than a little sadness, that I rise today to thank him for his extraordinary service, and to wish him much success and happiness in the years ahead.

Nominating Al Lenhardt to serve as the Senate's Sergeant at Arms was one of the great honors of my time as majority leader. It was also, I think, one of the best decisions I made in more than 30 years of public service.

I did not know Al before we began the search for a Sergeant at Arms in the summer of 2001. He was recommended to me by our former Secretary of the Senate, Jeri Thomson.

Jeri had met Al more than a decade ago when they were both at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. She was impressed by his intelligence, knowledge, steady demeanor and commitment to public service, characteristics she correctly noted are highly desirable in a Senate Sergeant at Arms.

Twenty minutes after meeting Al, I knew Jeri had identified the right person for this job.

I also knew, when I nominated Al, that he would make history in this Senate. What I did not realize is what a crucial role he would play, and what a difference he would make, in the history of this Senate.

Al Lenhardt is the first African American ever to serve as the Senate's top law enforcement and administrative officer. In fact, he is the first African American to serve as an elected officer of the Senate or House—ever.

That seems hard to believe, but it is true. And after 212 years, I must say, it was long overdue.

And he was the individual serving as the top law enforcement officer of the

Senate when the unimaginable happened—terrorists struck a devastating blow on American soil.

The September 11 attacks occurred less than a week after Al Lenhardt was sworn in as Sergeant at Arms. I do not think he took a day off for over 5 months.

Five weeks after September 11, a letter containing a lethal dose of anthrax was opened in my office.

That incident remains the largest bioterrorism attack ever on U.S. soil, and one of the most dangerous events in Congress' history.

Al Lenhardt's leadership ability, experience and demeanor were instrumental in the Senate's entry into the post-September 11 world. I am not sure that before that terrible day any of us fully appreciated the threat that America's enemies posed to our U.S. Capitol, a majestic and enduring symbol of our democracy.

Al Lenhardt rose to the challenge of protecting against further terrorist attacks on the Capitol complex and protecting the people who work in and visit these buildings—without closing "The People's House" to the people themselves.

Al provided calm and steady leadership in the face of danger that reassured us all in an extraordinarily stressful and emotional time.

When deadly anthrax was released in the Hart Building, 50 Senators and their staffs, and 15 committees and their staffs, were displaced for 96 days while the building was remediated.

Never before—not even when the British burned the Capitol in 1814, had so many Senators been uprooted.

Relocating them and their staffs presented an unprecedented logistical challenge. But Al Lenhardt and his staff, and the staffs of the Rules Committee and the Secretary of the Senate, responded quickly and well. The business of democracy never stopped.

Al Lenhardt stood tall in the face of danger. And his steady hand assured that the Senate kept functioning.

Over the past 18 months, Al Lenhardt rose to the occasion, demonstrating to me that he was indeed the right man, with the right skills and experience, in the right place, at the right time.

Al Lenhardt has had a remarkable public career.

He served in the United States Army for 32 years and as a combat veteran wears the Purple Heart earned in Vietnam.

He retired from the Army in 1997.

His last Army position was commanding general of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command at Ft. Knox, KY. From that post, he managed more than 13,000 people in 1,800 separate locations.

Before that, he served as the senior military police officer for all police operations and security matters throughout the Army's worldwide sphere of influence.

In the 1980s, he did counter-terrorism work in Germany against the Baader-Meinhof Gang and other terrorist groups.

He also was the former commander of the Army's Chemical and Military Police Centers at Fort McClellan, AL, which trains the military police who are guarding our bases overseas.

Al Lenhardt was born in Harlem 59 years ago.

He earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from the University of Nebraska, a master of arts degree in public administration from Central Michigan University, and a masters of science degree in the administration of justice from Wichita State University. He has also completed post-graduate studies at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, and the University of Michigan Executive Business School.

Between the Army and the Senate, he served for 4 years as executive vice president and chief operating officer of the Council on Foundations, where he worked to harness the power of philanthropy to meet some of America's most urgent unmet needs.

He has been active in an array of organizations, from the Boy Scouts of America, to the Boys and Girls Clubs of Washington, DC, the National Office of Philanthropy, and the Black Church Project.

He has been married for 38 years to Jackie Lenhardt, one of the few people I have ever met who has a more commanding presence than Al. Jackie and Al have three daughters—two lawyers and a doctor—and two grandchildren, Oly, who is 4, and Maya, who was born 2 months ago.

The closest thing to a complaint I've ever heard from anyone who knew Al Lenhardt in the Army was from an officer who took a battalion six years after Al had left it.

He said: "It's tough to go into a unit after Al Lenhardt because he leaves such strong footprints. Six years later, his policies and procedures still stood. He made a lasting impact on soldiers."

The one consolation in saying goodbye to Al Lenhardt is knowing that the policies and procedures he instituted here in the Senate will continue protecting us in the future.

Al's predecessor, Jim Ziglar, began the effort to modernize security and protect the Capitol in an age of terrorism. And he made a good start.

But I think even Jim would acknowledge that it is Al Lenhardt who deserves the lion's share of the credit for leading the Senate into the modern age of security and law enforcement.

If Congress is ever forced to vacate this building, or even this city, for any length of time, the Senate will be able to move and resume the work of democracy immediately in a new location under a "continuity of operations" plan that Jim Ziglar started and Jeri Thomson and Al Lenhardt completed.

While Al would be the first to state that more needs to be done, he has ensured that the Senate will continue operations in the event of any emergency.

The physical security around the Capitol is much stronger and intelligence gathering, analysis and sharing is much better today than it was on September 11th—largely because of Al Lenhardt.

We are better prepared to prevent attacks—and to respond if attacks happen—than we were before Al Lenhardt came here.

Because of Al Lenhardt, we know have an effective crisis communications network that uses state-of-the-art technology.

We have emergency evacuation plans and drills.

We've implemented state-of-the-art mail security to prevent another nightmare like the anthrax attack.

Capitol Police officers are getting new training to deal with the new threats. We are also expanding the police force—so our officers can get some much-deserved rest.

Al Lenhardt has played a leadership role in building stronger working relationships with security and intelligence experts at the departments of Homeland Security, Justice, Defense and other agencies.

That is another way Al Lenhardt made history.

The first Saturday morning after the anthrax letter was opened, Al was at work in the Capitol, surrounded by scientists and investigators. He had been at work until late the night before.

That morning, someone asked him: "If you had to decide all over again, would you still want this job?"

Al smiled his great, broad smile and—without a moment's hesitation—replied: "Absolutely. To be in a position to serve your country—what better job could there be?"

To that, Mr. President, I can only add: What better person could there have been in the Senate Sergeant at Arms' position these last 18 months than General Alfonso Lenhardt?

Certainly no one I have ever met.

Al Lenhardt has earned the respect and gratitude of every member of this Senate, and of this nation.

I am proud to have recommended him. I am proud to have served with him. And I am even more proud to call him my friend.

Indeed the entire Senate community is grateful to Al Lenhardt for what he has contributed to us, and we will miss him.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before the majority leader leaves the floor, I ask to be associated with the remarks he made about General Lenhardt. I add that in the years Senator DASCHLE has been the Democratic leader—he is starting his eighth year—he has done a lot of very good things for the State of South Dakota, our country, and the Senate. But nothing he has done has been more meaningful than selecting this professional, the first time in the history of our country, the Sergeant at Arms was a professional who had experience.

He was in charge of all the military police in the Army, a general in the United States Army, and was called upon for duty by Senator DASCHLE. If there were ever anyone with a vision regarding the problems this country faced and this Senate passed, Senator DASCHLE, in selecting General Lenhardt—because September 11 came during his honeymoon period. He had just gotten here.

We were so well served and have been so well served. I want the RECORD to reflect not only my great admiration and my friendship for General Lenhardt, I want the record to reflect for all Senator DASCHLE has done, nothing has been more important in the Senate than his selecting this good man for this most important job.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank my dear friend, the Senator from Nevada, for his very kind words.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I walked over to the floor without realizing we were giving a testament to General Lenhardt. But I could not agree more with the words I heard from Senator DASCHLE, as well as the words from Senator REID of Nevada. It is true, as I reflect upon it, that I know of no man who contributed greater service for his country than Al Lenhardt. He is such a professional. He is such a gentleman. He is so good. We trust him so much. We are so lucky that he was our Sergeant at Arms during the tragic times the Capitol family has been through the last couple of years.

I know we are all extremely proud of him and we will have very fond memories of his service here. I say to General Lenhardt, you are a great man, and we appreciate your service.

Mr. President, I rise today to pledge my support for our brave men and women who are on the front lines protecting America as we work to eliminate terrorism. . . . To pledge my support for the United States and all that our country represents: democracy, freedom of speech and religion, independence of thought. . . . And to pledge my support for our leaders and our free and open elections that allow democracy to thrive.

I also rise today to urge and insist that throughout the ongoing situation with Iraq, we remember our underlying goal: To protect our country from weapons of mass destruction and terrorist threats and stop those who provide assistance to terrorist operations. In order to fully accomplish these goals, we need the support and assistance of the broadest possible worldwide coalition of our allies.

It's not in our Nation's interest to establish arbitrary deadlines to force us to act without the support of others. This is not the time to isolate our country by moving into a unilateral war against Iraq.

A war that could result in massive casualties and long term devastation. A war that has the likely potential of

increasing terrorist threats against our Nation.

There is no question that the United States has the ability and the right to take necessary action to protect our country. But we should not burn bridges—bridges that we will surely need down the road—in our rush to war with Iraq.

There is no debate that the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein must come to an end. He has a long history of attacking and murdering his own people, employing chemical and biological weapons, and continually defying the limits set forth by the UN. There have been reported links between Iraq and terrorist activity, although no link has been established between Iraq and the events of September 11. The Iraqi people and the global community deserve to be free from a cruel dictator and the threat to safety that he represents. The credibility of the United Nations and of America is on the line.

We must take the time to fully weigh the risks and costs associated with unilateral action against the results we will achieve. The threat Iraq poses is not imminent, at least not so imminent that we can't continue with another week, or another month, of negotiations to garner the support of members of the United Nations Security Council.

The clock is ticking, but the alarm has not yet rung. I encourage the administration to continue inspections beyond their self-imposed March 17 deadline. In these final critical minutes, we have the opportunity to lay out hard and fast, mutually agreed upon benchmarks for Hussein to meet—or not meet—to determine his fate. Britain laid out definitive steps yesterday, such as allowing Iraq scientists to be interviewed abroad, destroying banned weapons and providing documentary evidence of any such destruction in the past.

While support for their resolution has not been overwhelming, it is important to continue along this path. Indeed, it is critical. We must both provide assistance to Britain, our strongest ally, while employing every resource at our command to garner Security Council support.

As the world's superpower, it is not only our responsibility, but it is in our best interest to lead. It's our responsibility to walk with and secure the support of our allies. The decisions we make in the coming days will have global reverberations and I am hopeful we won't have to endure the impacts alone.

In the case that unilateral military action is decided upon, the ramifications, lengthy reconstruction process and costs involved must be addressed. There are numerous reports that a war with Iraq will be a relatively short operation. But what follows in a month, in 6 months, in a year?

If the United States chooses to go it alone in Iraq and forsakes the support of a majority of our allies, the hurdles

and pitfalls will be numerous. And the likelihood of long term success and stability will be diminished. If we are successful in our mission to remove Saddam, a successor will need to be determined. The likelihood of Iraq becoming a democracy in our lifetime is unlikely. Even with the ousting of Saddam, we must be prepared and accepting of a moderate Arab government similar to others in the region.

The cost of rebuilding the country will be enormous, both in terms of money and manpower. From ensuring the Iraqi children can obtain clean water to establishing a forum for a free and open government to thrive. Are we willing to take those costs solely upon ourselves?

We must also be ready to focus our resources on the stability of the entire Middle East region and Muslim world. We need a comprehensive policy of economic engagement, one that includes expanded trade.

We should consider a trade benefits program similar to what we currently do for Africa, the Caribbean, and the Andean countries. In order to achieve long-term stability and reduce the terrorist threat, we will need to engage the entire region. And we will need our allies to assist in this engagement.

It's time to face facts. Our country is facing a troubling economy, unemployment, low growth, large national debt. Interest rates can't go much lower.

If we continue to disregard the concerns of other Security Council members and move forward with only a small band of countries that support immediate military action, the lion's share of the costs and military burden will fall on America's shoulders. Where will this money come from. How long must our troops be away from their families—months, years, decades? We must be fully prepared for this scenario before we move forward.

We are all in agreement that Saddam Hussein is a bad man and the threat he poses cannot be disregarded. While I unequivocally support removing Hussein from power, knowing that he is a peril to the region and the world, I urge that we move forward with a strong coalition of support. The clock is running down, but there is still time to gather our allies. Our long term interests—on every front—will be best achieved by standing together, united behind our common goal of eliminating terrorism and keeping our countries safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from Utah.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to my friend from

Montana. While I had not prepared a response, I feel, nonetheless, moved to make a response.

My colleague from Montana made the point that Saddam Hussein must be removed and then suggested that we need more time and we should be willing to grant more time. This is, indeed, the position of many people in the United Nations. They keep saying just another week, just another month if necessary. The Senator from Montana used that same timeframe.

In my opinion, we do not have that option. In my opinion, we have two options, not three. The two options are either to go ahead or to come home. The option of staying in place and allowing the inspections to go on for an indeterminate period of time is not a viable option.

The reason for that is that our troops are not where they are on anything like a permanent status. They are there at the indulgence of foreign governments that have allowed them to come in with the firm understanding that they will be there very briefly. In the countries where they are currently bivouacked, they are simply there, on the edge of moving forward.

If we now say to those countries, the host countries that are harboring our troops, we are going to leave them there for an indefinite period of time while the inspectors continue to poke around Iraq, I expect that country after country will say: No. We did not bargain for American troops in these numbers on our territory for an indefinite period of time.

If you are not moving ahead into Iraq, withdraw your forces and go home. And if we do withdraw our forces and go home, it is clear Saddam Hussein will not be removed until he dies. And he may very well die in his bed, because once the United States has sent the signal to the world that we are prepared to do whatever is necessary to remove this brutal dictator and then we back down and bring our troops home, we can never put them back in those places again. No host government currently allowing American forces on its soil will say OK, now that Saddam Hussein has nuclear weapons, you can come back and be on our soil and make us a target for those nuclear weapons. No. We have two choices. We can either move ahead or we can come home.

It is not the most sympathetic character in Shakespeare. A comment made by Lady Macbeth becomes appropriate here. "If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly."

If we are going to remove Saddam Hussein, we must do it quickly. And if we are not, we should not leave our troops in their present posture for an indefinite period of time while inspectors poke around on a scavenger hunt in Iraq.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, obviously, the major conversation today is about how we might successfully disarm Sad-

dam Hussein of the weapons of mass destruction, which many of us still believe are there in Iraq and pose a serious threat, not only to ourselves but to allies and others.

I certainly do not minimize the importance of dealing with this issue. In fact, as my constituents know, I voted for the resolution last fall authorizing the President to use force if that became necessary. I still support that position.

I think the President ought to have that authority from Congress. I am grateful to him for coming to Congress and asking for that kind of backing. When I voted to give him that authority, I did not mean, of course, necessarily that authority would be used regardless of other circumstances. And certainly, over the past several months, we have seen a concerted effort to try to resolve the problem of Iraq short of using military force.

In fact, the President's own words, deserve being repeated; that is, that he did not welcome or look forward to the use of military force to solve this problem. He hoped it would be resolved without using force. I applaud him for making those statements and hope he is still committed to that proposition.

I am concerned, still, as are many Americans, that we may see a military conflict in the coming days, and that every effort to try to resolve this matter, diplomatically and politically, has not yet been exhausted. I know the administration is working on it.

As one Member of this body, I encourage them to continue doing so. I do not mean indefinitely, obviously. There are obviously points at which you have to accept the fact that there is not going to be the kind of cooperation you would like to have. I certainly would not suggest we ought to go on indefinitely here at all, but I do believe our allies and friends—principally Great Britain, which has been remarkably steadfast in their loyalty to the U.S. Government on this issue—need to be listened to, that their advice and counsel have value and weight. And if there are ways in which you can craft resolutions which would build support at the U.N. Security Council, then we ought to try to do that. That does not mean you go on weeks trying to sort that out. But I hope every effort is being made to fashion just such an arrangement that would allow us to deal with Saddam Hussein.

I happen to believe, in the absence of the threat of force, I don't think diplomacy would work alone, nor do I necessarily believe the threat of force, without some effort by diplomacy and politics, would necessarily work as well as we would like.

It is a combination of the threat of force and the use of diplomacy that I think has produced the significant, positive results we have seen in the last number of weeks. And the President deserves credit for that, in my view.